DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 424 UD 019 381

AUTHOR Newby, Robert G.
TITLE Desegregation--Its Inequities and Paradoxes: Toward an Equitable and Just Educational Policy for Afro-Americans. Educational Policy for Afro-Americans.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979); Not available in hard copy due to author's restriction

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Black Students; *Educational Improvement; Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Integration Litigation; Integration Studies; *Public Policy; *Racial Discrimination; Racial Integration; *Racially Balanced Schools; Racism; *School Integration; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS Brown v Board of Education; Racial Isolation Report

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the major social science contributions to racial balance as a policy alternative to the unequal educational opportunity suffered by Afro-Americans. It is argued that, although the policy is considered by advocates and the courts to be a remedy for discrimination, it is in fact a continuation of white dominance, or racism. It is pointed out that support of this policy by proponents who are usually anti-racist creates a paradoxical situation. It is reasoned that the basis for this paradox rests with a certain lack of logic on the part of social scientists in both the "Brown" decision and the more recent "Racial Isolation Report." Poor conceptualization and inadequate or inappropriate methods are cited as reasons for a misleading understanding of what constitutes segregation and discrimination. These problems are discussed in detail along with a discussion of research findings which show that the benefits of desegregation are mixed but more often detrimental to Afro-American children. Replacement of the "race analysis" model with a class model is proposed for dealing with the problems discussed. The class model is described as having more explanatory power for the discrepancy between white and black achievement and as having more potential for uniting whites and blacks around a more broadly conceived issue of quality education and attacking the more fundamental problem of class bias in the schools. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MAY 1 - 1979

ED170424

"Desegregation -- Its Inequities and Paradoxes: Toward an Equitable and Just Educational Policy For Afro-Americans

by

Robert G. Newby

Wayne State University

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R.G. Newby

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Presented at the American Research Association Meetings in San Francisco April 8-12, 1979.

CG009381

Contributor Notes

Robert G. Newby is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Wayne State University. His major interest is race and education. He is co-author with David Tyack "Victims without 'Crimes': Somes Historical Perspectives on Black Education" and with Ronald Edmonds and Charles Cheng "Desgregation Planning and Educational Equity: Prospects and Possibilites"

Abstract

This article examines the major social science contributions to racial balance as a policy alternative to the unequal educational opportunity suffered by Afro-Americans. While the policy is considered by advocates and the courts to be a remedy for discrimination, it is in fact a continuation of white dominance, or racism. Given that the proponents of the policy are usually anti-racists their support for the policy creates a situation which might be viewed as paradoxical. The basis for the paradox rests with a certain lack of logic on the part of social scientists in both the Brown decision and the more recent "Racial Isolation Report." In fact, as a result of poor conceptualization and inadequate or inappropiate methods our understanding of what constitutes segregation and therefore discrimination is often misleading. In addition to discussing the aforementioned problems, there is a discussion of research findings which show that the benefits of so-called desegregation is at best mixed but more often than not detrimental to Afro-American children -- thus the continuing inequity. Given these problems of a policy based on a "race analysis" model, a class model is proposed as having more explanatory power for the discrepancy between white and black achievement. Also, using the class model has more potential for uniting blacks and whites around a more broadly conceived issue of quality education and attacking the more fundamental problem of class bias in the schools.

One of the critical issues facing America is that of school desegregation. We have witnessed the turmoil of Boston, Louisville and other cities which have already been ordered to implement specific desegregation plans. In fact the very future of our society may well be determined by how this problem is handled. Two of the nation's largest cities, Chicago and Los Angeles, are at varying stages of embarking upon massive busing programs as a remedy to past discrimination. Since the major focus of this policy is seen by policymakers and the courts as a remedy for the injustices faced primarily (but not exclusively) by Afro-Americans, particularly in the area of education, social scientists who are of that aggrieved black population have a responsibility to face this issue and offer our scholarly assessment and perspective for the consideration of policymakers and the general public. To suggest that black social scientists have a special responsibility relative to this issue is not to suggest an "insider" exclusivity or to suggest that all blacks would view the problem similarly (Merton, 1975; Willie, 1975). Rather it takes into account a more fundamental group self-interest that black scholars are likely to hold in our attempts to apply our scholarship to a cause of justice for Afro-Americans (and other persons of color). Because of this commitment to justice, and science as a relevant tool in that pursuit, our assessment must critically examine the theories, concepts and empirical findings related to the issue of school desegregation. This assessement will include the development and relevance of these scientific tools. Further, after having presented that scientific assessement, conclusions relative to this issue will be presented.

Several years ago Stokely Carmichael and Dr. Charles Hamilton asserted:

> "Integration" as a goal...speaks to the problem of blackness not only in an unrealistic way but also in a despicable way. It is based on complete acceptance of the fact that in order to have a decent house or education, black people must move into a white neighborhood or send their children to a white school. This reinforces among both black and white, the idea that "white" is automatically superior and "black" by definition inferior. For this reason, "integration" is a subterfuge for the maintenence of white supremacy. (1967:54)

The logic or truth content of their assertion would seem to be self-evident. Yet, the NAACP and the courts continue to advocate and rule, respectively, that schools be "integrated." Since the NAACP, and we might assume the courts, favor justice for Afro-Americans, the question becomes how do we reconcile the Carmichael-Hamilton assertion with the continuing press for "integrated" schools? The problem is not a simple one, yet we must bring some clarity to the paradox.

Compounding this problem is another key aspect. While "integration" is viewed as the remedy for the discrimination and exclusion which have been central to the life of Afro-Americans, the fact is that large segments of the white populace resist efforts to desegregate (Rubin, 1972; Coleman, 1975). Needless to say, much but not all, of that resistance is fundamentally racist in its content. As a result progressive people, black and white, who are anti-racists, by simply opposing racist resistance to "desegregation," find themselves supporting a cause which in itself denies equality for black children and supports white dominance (Willie, 1976). In other words, by favoring whatever racists oppose, progressive people

in this country are forced into a liberal position which is not only parternalistic but itself anti-black. That position is anti-black in that "integration" as presently conceptualized requires white dominance, or more directly white supremacy. That position is paternalistic in that busing is not desired by the general black population.* Consequently, there is an arrogance on the part of busing advocates which tells the populace, both black and white, what is best for them. Given the contradictions in the so-called desegregation effort for those who would favor justice and equality for Afro-Americans, is there any resolution to the problem? It is the purpose of this paper to explore precisely that problem as a social scientist whose concern is that justice and equality for Afro-Americans.

In pursuing this problem, it is necessary to address the conditions under which "desegregation" does and does not serve the equity interests of Afro-Americans and why. Related to that will be an examination of segregation as a scientific concept and why a lack of rigor in the concept's use has led to problems in formulating a relevant and just policy. Foremost in this examination will be a concern for correcting the racial inequities in existing and proposed educational policy. In conclusion, there is a caution relative to a possible unintended consequence of racial balance as a pervasive policy. A part of this concluding discussion is an exploration of the class content schooling and a suggestion that class concerns are more important than race per se

---

*This assertion will be discussed in more detail later.

as critical defining characteristics of schooling, including their possibilities for interracial cooperation.

Desegregation: Its Logic and Illogic

No doubt the most important governmental act on behalf of Afro-Americans in this century was the 1954 Supreme Court decision. That decision essentially stripped away the legal sanction of subordinate status for black people. That is, prior to May 17, 1954 it was constitutional for black people to be relegated to any place and anything whites deemed appropriate under the guise of "separated but equal." That is to say that the practice of Plessey v. Ferguson did not substantially counter Justice Taney's majority opinion in Dred Scott that the black man "has no rights which the white man is bound to respect" (Blaustein and Zangrando, 1968). The 1954 decision in the overturning of such "white liberty" enhanced the status of black people as citizens--that is, so-called second-class citizenship was no longer the law of the land. Consequently, we might conclude, as did Lerone Bennett (1962) in his Before the Mayflower, that the '54 decision ushered in a new epoch.

For some this new "epoch" has not been that at all. Many Black Nationalists who have been struggling for community control disregard and in some cases hold in contempt the '54 decision. In fact, it is not unusual to hear some black nationalists say, "that dammed Supreme Court decision started all this 'integration' mess." They would agree with Robert Maynard who states that," [Integration] argues that demanding a place for black children in a white school is an admission of inherent black inferiority" (emphasis added, 1970:102). While the frustration of

blacks gaining control of predominately black institutions is more often than not subverted because of some supposed concern about "separatism" and the so-called desirability of "integration,"[1] it is crucial to recognize the fact that what the Court did in 1954 was to redefine the status of Afro-Americans. Even more, that victory raised the struggle to a higher level. In other words, before one can have the "right to self-determination," as the nationalists advocate one must first have rights, Justice Taney notwithstanding. It is from this perspective that the '54 Supreme Court decision has to be viewed, and it is this perspective which allows us to see the importance of that ruling as a turning point in the history/predicament of Afro-Americans.

That turning point, however, did not "liberate" black folks and has at times been used to our detriment. It is only logical to question how/why that happens? Much of the answer to those queries lies in the fact that Brown v. Topeka was the correct decision for many of the wrong reasons! It is this contradiction which brings us to the possible dilemma of "integration" being racist. On closer inspection of the decision we find that the court concluded that:

> To separate them [black children] from others of similar age and qualification solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely to be undone (emphasis added U.S. 347, 1954)

It is important to note that the Court was saying that separation of races is bad or harmful, and therefore unjust and illegal, when the separation is based solely on the criterion of race because such separation affects the separated group's status. The injustice of

such assigned separation automatically subordinates the status (i.e., the power, prestige and privilege) of the separated group. The primary issue in that decision was the question of status of black people as a class (group). If justice is/was to prevail that step was essential and correct.

On the other hand, the court was not saying and should not have been interpreted as saying, that whenever blacks were separated from whites they (blacks) are likely to suffer psychological damage. If that were so, well over 95% of Afro-Americans would be in trouble just being at home! Such a contention would be absurd. Nonetheless, the continuing efforts to desegregate and "integrate" black folks are designed to save blacks from psychological damage. This is particularly so, or is asserted to be so, in relationship to schools; our children must sit next to white folks no matter who they are for a decent education. As we viewed the turmoil of South Boston or Louisville and now Chicago, on what basis can it be asserted that it is blacks who are "culturally deprived?"[2] So, the question becomes how did we get to such illogic? This mental health "necessity" which undergirds that continuing racial balance policy has two basic sources: first, a portion of the social science testimony for Brown; and second, the more recent "Racial Isolation Report."

The Illogical Contributions of Social "Science"

The most fundamental feature of science, if it is science, is that it be logical. As social science broaches the issue of unequal educational opportunity for blacks and other persons of color this fundamental assumption does not hold. The discussion which follows attempts to

illuminate this problem. As we stated earlier, there are two basic sources which led us to our present predicament. The first source is of course the majority opinion in Brown. Let us look at that aspect of the Brown testimony which suggested the necessity of black children sitting next to whites to enhance their learning. Weighing heavily in that decision was the testimony of the eminent black social psychologist, Dr. Kenneth Clark. His key testimony was based upon the work of himself and his wife, Dr. Mamie Clark, as well as the work of other liberal social scientists[3] (cf. footnote #11, U.S. 347, 1954). Essentially, their work suggested that Afro-Americans suffered from severly damaged self-concepts. One such example of their work which was a part of the testimony was a report of the well-known "doll studies" (Clark & Clark, 1974). In those "experiments" black children were more likely to pick the white doll rather than a colored doll as being "nice," "pretty," and "looking like themselves."

There might be numerous reasons for such results--an obvious one is that these children hate themselves. That is the most common conclusion, but before accepting that argument, let us examine another of the Clarks' studies which buttressed that argument. The other study was a coloring test in which they asked black children to color a face to "look like themselves" (coloring book style). The results were as follows:

[TABLE I ABOUT HERE]

An initial inspection of the table would seem to suggest that the Southern children's "identity thing" was more "together." But no, at least as Clark testified before the court. When speaking of the

results Clark explained that while Southern children "may appear" to be more healthy, their "apparent emotional stability... may be indicative only of the fact that through rigid racial segregation and isolation he has accepted as normal the fact of his inferior status" (Clark, 1955:145). In short, according to Clark's interpretation, black children in the North suffered from low self-esteem as indicated by their (64%) perceiving themselves to be white or some other color. But, black children in the South suffer from low self-esteem because they (80%) perceive themselves to be brown.

While Dr. Clark offered the most critical expert testimony for the Brown decision he was not alone and in fact was only representative of a large contingent of liberal social scientists. And while those of us who feel that the 1954 decision was essential and correct we must recognize with Lewis Killian (1975) some of the excesses and erroneous judgments made by social scientists in that case. Killian states:

> Because of their professional judgment that their theories were valid, and because of the equalitarian and humanitarian ethos of the social sciences, many sociologists, psychologists and anthropologists played the dual role of scientists and liberal ideologist with force and conviction. Without gainsaying the validity of the conclusion that segregation is psychologically harmful to its victims, it must be recongized that the typically skeptical, even querulous, attitude of scientists toward each other's work were largely suspended in this case. ...[Further] it was not enough for the social scientist to affirm his belief in the harmful effect of segregation to escape suspicion of being either senile, bigoted or mercenary. Even to examine the difficulties of achieving the goals of desegregation and assimilation with any but an optimistic bias was suspect (1975:47).

As we witness the attacks (which are at times vitriolic) on Derrick Bell (1975), a law professor at Harvard and former NAACP attorney, as well as others such as David Armor (1972) who find that "desegregation", or more accurately racial balance, may not be "the savior" for the education of blacks, the profundity of Killian's observation becomes all the more central to our understanding of the ideological underpinnings of this issue (Clark, 1976; Chambers, 1976; Jones, 1976; and Pettigrew, (1973). The tone of the attempted refutations of Bell and Armor among others suggests that the "force and conviction" of the liberal ideology continues.

On the other hand, the "Promise of Brown" seems to be fading. The assertions of these social scientists for Brown have been tested. In addition to the contradictions in the interpretations of the "doll studies," Stephan (1978) has tested four hypotheses which he derived from the social science testimony in Brown:

1. For whites, desegregation will lead to more positive attitudes towards blacks.
2. For blacks, desegregation will lead to more positive attitudes toward whites.
3. For blacks, desegregation will lead to increases in self-esteem.
4. For blacks, desegregation will lead to increases in achievement (1978:221)

None of these hypotheses have been consistently supported. The essence of Brown, however, needs little social science evidence to suggest that de jure segregation by definition depresses the status of those set apart as were blacks. Consequently, we might reiterate that the favorable decision of Brown was correct for many of the wrong reasons - reasons which continue to shape policy.

In the more recent years since the Brown decision, we find the second important basis for the "separation/psychological damage" model. In fact the model was extended to include not only segregation but any racial "isolation." Now we find that the continuing press by the NACCP along with a contingent of liberal social scientists as its expert witnesses and the courts to "racially balance" the schools is based on the "Racial Isolation Report" of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. That report concludes:

> Negro children suffer serious harm when their education takes place in public schools which are racially segregated, whatever the source of the segregation may be... Negro children who attend predominantely Negro schools do not achieve as well as other children, Negro or white. Their aspirations are more restricted than those of other children. When they become adults... they are more likely to fear, dislike and avoid white Americans. The conclusion drawn by the U.S. Supreme Court about the impact upon children of segregation compelled by laws--that it "affects their hearts and minds in ways unlikely to be undone" --applies to segregation not only compelled by law... Negro children believe their schools are stigmatized and regarded as inferior... (emphasis added, USCCR, 1967:193).

In response to the report's conclusion, several comments might be made which tend to challenge those conclusions:

1. The data that concludes that racial segregation per se is cause for black children scoring lower on achievement tests does not exist.

2. Relative to separation leading to racial fears we could speculate now about the future attitudes of the black children of the South Boston and Charlestown wars "when they become adults" to see if they are "more likely to fear, dislike and avoid white Americans" than children of predominately black schools.

3. It is questionable that the masses of blacks ever "bought" the notion that black schools were stigmatized. But even if that was the case, present research strongly suggests that such a notion died with "Black is beautiful!" (Frazier, 1940; Johnson, 1940; Guterman, 1972).

While space does not permit an extensive review of the literature which supports each of the three issues raised here, some empirical support can be cited which provides a basis for these challenges to the assertions which were a part of the Commission's conclusions.

Let us now examine the Commission's conclusion that:

> Negro children who attend predominately Negro schools do not achieve as well as other children, Negro and White. Their aspirations are more restricted than those of other children... (USCCR, 1967:193).

This conclusion is not supported empirically. Recently there have been two excellent reviews of the desegregation literature, (St. John, 1975 and Stephan, 1978). Neither of which supports the Commission's conclusion. St. John (1975) in her book School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children, on the issue of "desegregation" and academic achievement, concluded the following:

> [A]dequate data have not been gathered to determine a causal relation between school racial composition and academic achievement. More than a decade of considerable research effort had produced no definitive positive findings (1975:36)

Consistent with the St. John review and conclusion Stephan (1978) presents the following tabulation in his similar review.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Note that less than one-third of the studies show positive outcomes as a result of the "desegregation" process. As both Stephan and St. John

point out there are numerous methodological problems with a bulk of this work. The major problem in this area of research is that the situation can seldom be controlled sufficiently to meet the assumptions of a rigorous research design. On the other hand, the shortcomings of this research would seem to be as applicable to those studies showing positive results as those showing mixed or negative results. Even more, the scientific basis for the Commission's conclusion would seem to be mitigated in light of such scanty evidence.

Apart from the above rather systematic line of research but related to the conclusion that the achievement and aspirations of Afro-Americans are interwined with racial composition is the little-known "Dunbar Story." Thomas Sowell (1972), a black economist presently a highly regarded faculty member at U.C.L.A. was a graduate of Washington, D.C.'s Dunbar High School. During the school's period of "academic ascendency, from about 1870 to 1955" Sowell cites the following:

> Dunbar was an all-black high school throughout this period. Approximately three-quarters of all Dunbar graduates went on to college over this eighty-five year span, even though college attendance was the exception rather than the rule for most white Americans for most of the period, and was extremely rare among blacks. Most of the Dunbar graduates could afford to go only to the local teacher's college or to Howard University, but each year Dunbar sent a contingent off to some of the leading colleges in the nation as well. As far back as 1918-1923, Dunbar graduates earned 14 degrees at Harvard and Amherst. Over the years, 34 Dunbar graduates went to Amherst (7 becoming Phi Beta Kappas), 22 to Darthmouth, 12 to Oberlin... The first black general, the first black cabinet member, the first black senator since reconstruction, the discoverer of blood plasma, the first black federal judge [were Dunbar graduates] (1972:283-4).

If the Commission's conclusion about racial composition, achievement and aspiration was correct then there could have been no Dunbar. In fact, Sowell goes on to say:

> The massive overhauling of the District of Columbia's segregated educational system... had the net effect of quickly turning Dunbar into just another ghetto high school with all of the usual problems (1972:284).

Given this contrary evidence relative to achivement and aspiration it becomes apparent that Court decisions which use as their basis the conclusions of the "Racial Isolation Report" are misguided.* But more importantly, to the extent the racial balance policy obviates efforts toward quality education for students of color such a policy is pernicious and therefore a violation of equal protection.

Having examined that aspect of the Commission's conclusion relative to "racial isolation," achievement and aspirations let us now turn to the other two issues raised above. As to the issue that racial antipathy or fear will be lessened through racial balance, the evidence, like that of achievement, does not support such a claim. Once again, however, the research design problems discussed earlier would apply to the attitudinally liable and in most instances less valid than achievement tests the problems was based on similar scientific evidence let us now examine the state of those findings. According to St. John (1975) we find quite a mixture of results. After desegregation, for whites of 35 studies, eleven show more positive attitudes toward blacks with another 13 finding either no

---

*The Gittleson (Los Angeles) decision among others employed direct language from the Commission's conclusions. Even more, he went on to conclude that whatever held true for "Negroes" applied to Mexican-Americans as well.

change or mixed results. For blacks, 28 studies were cited, of these six, found more positive attitudes toward whites. But ten found that black attitudes towards whites increased negatively with the other twelve showing either no change or mixed results. Stephan's (1978) findings were similar. In his tabulation, which excluded studies using sociometric choices, the results are as follows:

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Note that for "black prejudice toward whites" the studies are about evenly divided between decrease and increase. But for whites, there is a 4:1 tendency in these findings for prejudice to increase towards blacks

Once again, we cannot be too cautious about the meaning of these studies since they may not be comparable and we do not know the conditions under which these data were gathered.* For example, the Armor (1972) study which was included in both reviews found that black attitudes toward whites were less favorable among older students. Such a finding among black students involved in a voluntary busing program might seem to be very surprising. However, as we reflect back to the late 1960's and early 1970's when this data was collected, we can note that this was a period of rising racial consciousness among blacks. Such a reflection might suggest that the increasing negative attitudes towards whites may have been more related to a "movement ideology" at the height of the Black Power Movement than to desegregation. Consequently, this study might not aid our understanding of how desegregation per se is likely to effect racial attitudes. But even with limitations such as these the empirical support for the Commission's claim seems to be tenuous at best.

---

*St. John (1975) did attempt to critically analyze the studies she reviewed and as a part of that critical analysis she tried to point out the conditions and limitations of the various studies.

But more pertinent than the empirical evidence might be the development of an increased interracial hostility as a result of the violent resistance to busing for racial balance. At this time we can only speculate about the impact of the experience on blacks and whites for their present and future attitudes towards each other. But the reaction is often expressed as such an extreme violent racism that even the death of young child is praised as a victory for resistance. No doubt the intensity of such feeling will have a profound impact on both the perpetrators as well as its victims. In light of this preponderance of evidence can the proponents of the Commission's conclusion be so sanguine?

As to the third point, relative to blacks feeling themselves and predominantely black schools are stigmatized, we can only assume that if black children felt that way under some circumstances that is certainly not the prevailing feeling among black youngsters today. In fact, the research tends to suggest a real pride and the maintenance of black institutions.

Earlier, in the discussion of the Clark interpretation of his self-concept data, it was shown that the conclusions about blacks having lower self-esteem in predominately black schools was speculation and not supported by the data. Also related to a discussion of this point might be how the Dunbar students and community perceived themselves and their school. Did they feel it stigmatized simply because it was black? Stephen (1978) in his review tends not to support the Commission's conclusion about the effect of a predominately black school on the self-esteem of blacks. In fact, his review found some studies where the self-esteem of blacks was higher in predominately black schools. Even more, he found no studies where the self-esteem of blacks was higher in racially mixed schools.

In sum, the evidence grows slimmer everyday that school "integration" as presently conceptualized and practiced is beneficial for black children. In fact, in those areas most crucial to personal development, self-esteem and occupational aspirations, the data seems to suggest that "integration" might well be detrimental to black children (St. John, 1975). Also, given the indignities suffered by black children as a result of violent racist resistance as in Chicago and Boston, the assertion of Carmichael and Hamilton that "integration" is a subterfuge for white supremacy might be profoundly prophetic.

Where does this leave us? On the one hand, it is logical and necessary that black people in particular, and society in general, be intolerant to the subordinated status of segregation. At the same time, it would be illogical to be dispersed and obliterated as the liberal ideology might require; in other words, dispersed to such an extent that the common history/experience of Afro-Americans qua Afro-Americans ceases to exist. It was this concern that was raised by Milton Gordon when he suggested that in the liberals' zeal to oppose segregation and discrimination:

> [T]he question of whether Negroes, or Jews, or Catholics, or Mexican-Americans should maintain or lose their group identity in the America of the future is one which, receives no thoughtful attention or is dealt with in cliches (1964:8).

While this concern may "receive no thoughtful attention" from those scholars who have fallen victim to the liberal ideology described by Gordon, two eminent black scholars have charged black intellectuals to be ever mindful of this problem. DuBois (1960) in a stimulating article "Whither Now and Why" raised serious questions for the future of Afro-Americans as we approach equality. DuBois queried:

...[W]hat we must now ask ourselves is when we become equal American citizens what will be our aims and ideals and what will we have to do in selecting these aims and ideals. Are we to assume that we will simply adopt the ideals of Americans and become what they are or want to be and that we will have in the process no ideals of our own?

That would mean that we would cease to be Negroes as such and become white in action if not completely in color. We would take on the culture of white Americans doing as they do and thinking as they think.

Manifestly this would not be satisfactory. Physically it would mean that we would be integrated with Americans losing first of all, the physical evidence of color and hair and racial type. We would lose our memory of Negro history and of racial pecularities which have long been associated with being Negro. We would cease to acknowledge any greater tie with Africa than England or Germany. We would not try to develop Negro Music and Art and Literature as distinctive and different, but allow them to further degraded as is the case today. We would always, if possible, marry lighter-hued people so as to have children who are not identified with the Negro race, and thus solve our problem in America by committing racial suicide.....

I repeat I am not fighting to settle the question of racial equality...by getting rid of the Negro race... forgetting the slave trade and slavery, and the struggle for emancipation; of forgetting abolition and especially of ignoring the whole cultural history of Africans in the world.

No! What I have been fighting for ... is the possibility of black folk and their cultural patterns existing in America without discrimination; and on terms of equality. If we take this attitude we have got to do so consciously and deliberately (DuBois 1960: 149-150).

A similar assessment was made by E. Franklin Frazier (1968) in his "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual." In that work Frazier suggested that black intellecutals were erroneously abandoning the cultural uniqueness of blacks by pursuing assimilation in an unqualified fashion. The logic of the DuBois and Frazier arguments would seem to support an intolerance for segregation while simultaneously being careful not to destroy black institutions, including schools. In fact, DuBois (1935) made an excellent case for maintaining some black schools not as an acquiesce to segregation but as a means toward quality education. What these two bulwarks of black social thought are suggesting is that black people can maintain their integrity as a people and still be full-fledged Americans. Given that this may appear to be a fine line, how do we make the distinction--or better, when is segregation, segregation?

When is Segregation, Segregation? - in Science

What is segregation? While this question may appear to be academic, rhetorical or trite, much of the problem facing American society relative to Afro-Americans rests in the answer to this question. The term has numerous meanings when employed by lay people and the situation is not much improved in the social sciences. In some instances it means "any ecological process" in which the land use is in some manner specialized or separated from other uses. Other times the term is employed to mean any "voluntary or involuntary separation of residence areas on the basis of race, religion or ethnic characteristics..." (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:374). At other times the term is synonymous with discrimination. Consequently, we find ourselves in a rather common position that has plagued the development of the social sciences: a lack of sufficient development of concepts, those basic tools which are central to and for our study. This is particularly problematic in that the use of the term

suggests such a variety of phenomena. In fact, the variety is so great that two diametrically opposed forms of separation - voluntary or involuntary - are suggested by social scientists to manifest the same consequences. The logic of those social scientists who would make such a claim suggests that the children in Beverly Hills (Calif.), Bloomfield Hills (Mich.), Grosse Pointe (Mich.), Scarsdale (N.Y.) and Hillsborough (Calif.) who have been voluntarily "segregated" from the mass of American society are likely to suffer the harmful effects of "segregation." Absurd, right? Is it any less absurd that blacks who voluntarily decide to live in the Baldwin Hills section of Los Angeles or the Sherwood Forest section of Detroit will suffer these harmful effects simply because they live in a predominately black community? The content of concepts, including segregation, must be restricted such that the phenomena that they attempt to capture must be not only empirically valid but also clear and consistent in their uses. As the above discussion indicates, such has not been the case with "segregation."

As discussion above suggests the lack of rigor and rather loose usage of the concept as presently employed leads to not only poor theoretical development but poor social policy as well. On the other hand, the statement below offers an opportunity for some clarity about the real meaning of segregation for people's lives and is suggested to be a viable conceptulization of the problematic phenomenon:

> In recent years greater stress has come to be placed on that usage of the term in which [segregation] denotes that geographic separation and separate use of facilities which is forced upon subordinate categories and groups of person by law, custom as "gentleman's agreement." This usage

> applies mainly to ethnic, religious and racial categories and groups. This kind of segregation is exemplified by Jewish ghettos in medieval Europe, current practices in South Africa and to varying degrees in various parts of the United States... (emphasis in original, Bain, 1964"628).

Notice that this definition clearly states that force is a necessary condition for separation to be considered segregation. We should also note that such statements as "whatever the source," (as suggested by "The Racial Isolation Report") according to this definition, fall outside the concept's scope. This is not being put forth as merely a semantic argument but as W.I. Thomas so eloquently states, as people define their situations those situations become real in their consequences (Thomas, 1948). Even though it is not our intention to reduce the world to sheer subjectivism as the Thomas statement might indicate, we do suggest that voluntary and involuntary "segregation" are not the same phenomena either subjectively (i.e., as to how people interpret these situations) or objectively (in their real consequences for the separated group's status). Consequently, we argue that "the source" of racial concentration must be forced racial separateness to be considered segregation. In short, segregation is coercive separation.

One of the consequences of this more restricted "definition of the situation" would be a social policy which takes into account these meanings of segregation to the subordinated group or the aggrieved party as well the larger society. While subjectively the advocates of racial balance might argue that "racial isolation" (whatever that means) and segregation are the same, objectively that is simply not the case.

The school attendance zones subsequent to Brown, particularly in the North, have not been based solely on race. For example, blacks particularly since the open housing mandates of the late 60's have not perceived that their school attendance zones were based solely on race. In fact, the community control movement which has been undermined by "intergrationists" (Cf. Grant; UFT Statement) was a demand for quality education not racial mixing. Consequently, the problem is not the separateness of blacks from whites but equal treatment (i.e., equality of facilities, equality of finances, equality of outcomes, etc.); that is the major concern. To suggest that such equal treatment only comes about through the presence, or even more the dominance, of whites "reinforces among both black and white, the idea that white is automatically superior..." (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967:54).

Robert Maynard (1970) has suggested that the separation of blacks may well be a "liberating force" from white dominance. Maynard's suggestion is not an isolated statement of some extremist but rather captures a more general feeling of black people. That is not to say that a separatist ideology is the prevailing character of the black community but that Afro-Americans, in our uncomprising pursuit for equality, have little desire to sacrifice our institutions and identity. In fact, what the liberal social scientists who insist that "integration" is the only answer the problems facing black people fail to recognize is the impact of "the movement" on the "gestalt" of Afro-Americans.

As a consequence of the movement and its ideology, we have witnessed a change in nomenclature as it related to a people who are no longer "Negroes" as was the case in the early 1960's but are now "black"

Similarly, while black was once derogatory, it is now beautiful. Aspects of the "black experience" which are often disclaimed as sterotypes become redefined and revered through "soul" and Africanism. (Turner, 1969) In general, there became a manifest pride in being black. With the prevalence of this more recent "gestalt" what is the basis for a premise that "anything all-black (including a school) is bad?" In fact the emergence of such entities as a Miss Black America Contest in all of its pagentry, the Black Athletes Hall of Fame, or the various black caucuses of professional associations including the Association of Black Sociologists, are indicative of the fallacy of "segregation" whatever the source is harmful. We might conclude, then, that separation, or "isolation" is not a sufficient condition to manifest an institution as being inherently inferior. Consequently, the present nominal conceptualization of "segregation" diminishes and utility of the concept as an aid to our understanding the problem.

Why would a concept so central to such a critical issue be so loose? Of course, the explanations are numerous but two stand out: 1) theoretically race relations is still in its "pubic stages" and 2) the assimilationist bias of the field ideologically clouds the thinking of many of its scholars. These gaps particularly the latter, have lead to an abandonment of rigorous thinking in the field. Metzger (1970) has stated the problem as follows:

> Sociologist, by the large, have accepted [the] image of Horatio Alger in the Melting Pot as the ideal definition of American society incorporation of American's Ethnic and Racial Minorities into the mainstream culture is virtually inevitable. Successful assimilation, moreover, has been viewed as synomous with equality of opportunity and upward mobility for the members of minority groups; "opportunity," is the opportunity to disregard one's ethnicity

> and to partake fully in the "American Way of Life" in this sense assimilation is viewed as the embodiment of the democratic ethos (1970:628)

We would argue that it is precisely this ideological bias on the part of liberal social scientists which has led to the racial balance remedy supported by the "separation/psychological damage" doctrine. Given this orientation is it any wonder as to why the concept "segregation" is so ill-defined and further why alternatives or remedies such as "desegregation" and "integration" become so problematic?

Desegregation: Toward Equity

More than a decade ago Handlin (1955) raised the most central issue relative to this when he addressed "the goals of integration." But before discussing that issue we must once again attempt to refine, conceptually, such terms as "integration" and "desegregation." First "desegregation" is the removal of the imposed restriction of segregation. That is to say that if segregation is a forced separation and exclusion, then desegregation would be the elimination of that force such that the separated group is allowed freedom of access to the benefits accorded to other members of society.

Racial integration, on the other hand, is intended to mean the thorough mixing of races. However, social scientists should understand that integration is more of a qualitative notion than a quantitative one. That is to say that (social) integration has to do with the body-social adhering to a common set of values, norms, beliefs, etc. Consequently, integration has little to do with where people sit but much more to do with the commonality of what people believe and the extent to which they, together,

strive for common goals. Consequently, the advocacy of "racial integration" in a society which is regarded by some scholars to be inherently racist in its most fundamental values would require blacks to adopt those values which declare "the Rightness of Whiteness." Is it conceivable that the black population, generally, would internalize such values? Given this discussion, it seems as though "racial integration" might be a term which is contradictory in that in the American context, since such a notion requires black self-denial rather than affirmation of a sense of peoplehood.

Let us now return to that more fundamental question raised by Handlin relative to what might be the goals of "integration." As we discuss these goals you will note that the terms to which we just addressed ourselves will be central to this exploration. Consequently, our discussion now will not hinge on Handlin's term "integration" as much as the more general ideas which are really the essence of his topic. In raising the question as to what might be the goals of "integration" Handlin cites the following:

> The term integration sometimes refers to the openness of society, to a condition in which every individual can make the maximum number of voluntary contacts with others without regard to qualifications of ancestry. In that sense, the objective is the leveling of all barriers to association other than those based on ability, taste and personal preference (1965:270).

He goes on to say:

> But integration sometimes also refers to a condition in which individuals of each racial or ethnic group are randomly distributed through the society so that every realm of activity contains a representative cross section of the population. In that sense the object is the attainment, in every

occupational, educational and residential distribution, of a balance among the constituent elements in the society (1965:270)

One should note that the former calls for a "cease and desist" of exclusion and discrimination while the latter calls for a random racially balanced distribution of all society's institutions.

Having explored these alternative goals of "desegregation the question then becomes which of these alternative policy positions is more likely to provide equity for black children? In the South where blacks were restricted in their attendance to schools designated solely for blacks, the elimination of every vestige of such segregation (i.e. root and branch") may have required, at least temporarily, racial balance. On the other hand, in the North in those cases where black's could move to another attendance zone if they so chose, and as is certainly the case in 1978, racial balance might well be not only irrelevant but inappropriate.

The Detroit case presents excellent examples for a discussion of the appropriateness of racial balance for providing equity for black children. Several schools which were located in racially mixed neighborhoods and viewed by the school community as being ideal in that regard were found to be victims of the Court's racial balance transfer mandate. In other cases such as these reiterate the powerlessness of blacks. In addition to these specific cases the more general feeling about "desegregation" in Detroit was perceived rather negatively. For example only 31% of blacks thought that desegregation would improve the quality of education for black or white students (Mar, Op. 1975:18). Stated otherwise, nearly 70% of Detroit's black community thought little or no benefit would be gained from desegregarion. As to busing specifically, on 27% favored busing as a remedy to the so-called segregated Detroit schools while more than

70% "did not endorse" or more definitely opposed busing as a "remedy for school racial composition (Mar. Op. 1975). Such figures are probably not unique to Detroit. In fact, several black families in Cleveland attempted to enter that case on the side of the Board of Education in opposition to the NAACP claim. Such opposition sentiments strongly suggest that blacks do not perceive the desegregation strategies which are presently being pursued as being beneficial and on their behalf. In fact, the opposite seems more likely to be the case, the racial balance policy further mitigates against the desires and goals of blacks. To the extent that this is the case then we might conclude that racial balance further subordinates the status of blacks rather than allowing greater democracy or self-determination. In other words, a deprived status based upon racial composition of the schools in not the same in these schools as had been in the case in Brown; blacks in general do not desire racial balance. Consequently, as these examples point out, the dispersion remedy works to further disadvantage and subordinate rather than provide equity for black children.

At the time of Brown and for years subsequent to Brown, the major concern was equality of educational opportunity but at this point in our history the issue has become racial balance to the exclusion of all other concerns. The social science evidence which shows that few, if any, benefits are derived for either black or white children as a result of desegregation is ignored or denounced. The issue for the racial balance advocates has been the mixing of bodies such that blacks are always in a minority rather than an improved education for blacks. In fact, the concern raised by James Coleman (1975) which suggested that desegregation leads to "white flight" is a concern for, the degree

possible, keeping the white majority in the cities, not equality in education. Essentially what this means is that black children are placed in the vulnerable position of being subordinated in numerous ways:

1. Classroom teachers and white students often regard them as interlopers.

1. Blacks are disciplined (i.e., suspended, excluded, etc.) at a rate that far exceeds their proportion in the school.

3. Opportunity for participation in the broad range of school affairs is lessened.

4. Most importantly, the hostility of the receiving school often tends to retard their academic achievement.

The non-Southern school district which has served as the racial balance model Berkeley, California, is now reporting about after a decade of two way busing that there is an increasing disparity between white and non-white achievement. According to the reports from Berkeley this disparity leads to separation in the classroom and on the playground (Berkeley Gazette, 1976).

While the example which follows is not suggested to be a typical outcome of racial balance it rather poignantly highlights some of the racial costs of black students as a result of such a policy:

> Central High School in Louisville, Kentucky is the alma mater of Muhammed Ali. The school was designed and built for black students and was a center for the black inner-city neighborhood surrounding it. It was an object of pride for Louisville's black community before desegregation. But, in December, 1976, Central held a contest to decide who had the best Afro hairstyle. Two white students from the suburbs won. Cheryl Phillips, a black senior said this: "It seems that blacks don't count. With desegregation we don't get recognition." (Sizemore, 1978:67-8)

One could argue that the increasing disparity in achievement and the social loses to blacks which result from this policy have little to do with separation or integration with racism and class bias in the very fabric of schools. In the face of these obstacles liberal social scientists, the NAACP and the Courts push on toward racial balance with

the Utopian vision at the end of the rainbow - The Melting Pot. Equity for black students has been abandoned for this "higher" goal.

In sum, rather than "chasing rainbows" we must seek appropriate equitable remedies to discrimination in education. To do this we must first establish what is the nature of that discrimination. If that discrimination has resulted in the school's racial composition being predominately black then we must seek a desegregation remedy which would entail a "cease and desist" and appropriate compensation to the victims of such subordination. That compensation should enhance opportunities for recouping status losses which resulted from that policy. On the other hand, we should recognize the limits and serious, ofttimes deleterious, shortcomings of the racial balance posture as a remedy.

Problems and Limitations for Racial Balance as a Reform

To the extent that scholars, blacks and others, are concerned about justice and equal treatment for Afro-Americans we must articulate a response to the present "racial balance crisis" which places equity for Afro-Americans in the forefront. Further, we must continue to be scientists and minimize being ideologues. By that is meant that rigor, scepticism and separating value questions from empirical questions are essential. Consistent with the pursuit of justice for Afro-Americans and at the same time being true (as best we can) to our role as scientists our hard look at racial balance and its alternatives must take into account at least the two following questions which are central to the whole crisis:

1. To what extent is schooling a relevant target in that quest for equality?

2. What might be a broader meaning for the society as a whole to the widespread resistance to busing for racial balance by whites?

While the discussion of these two issues is not suggested to exhaust the possibilities or limitations of the present racial balance policy, these two issues are central to any such discussion. Toward that end what follows is a brief discussion of each question.

Let us turn briefly to the first question: to what extent is schooling a relevant target in the quest for equality for Afro-Americans? Several years ago Christopher Jencks (1972) attempted to answer this question in his massive review of the research literature relative to this question. Jencks was criticized, particularly by black scholars, on several points. Howard Taylor (1973) suggested that Jencks was "Playing the Dozens with Path Analysis." Edmonds et al., (1972) suggested that among other things Jencks tended to "let schools off the hook." Those criticisms notwithstanding Jencks concluded:

> None of the evidence we have reviewed suggests that school reform can be expected to bring about significant social changes outside the schools. More specifically, the evidence suggests that equalizing educational opportunity would do very little to make adults more equal (1972:255).

To the extent that Jencks' conclusion is correct then we must view racial balance as a policy in which the outcomes will be quite restricted particularly vis-a-vis its advocates' claim. Jencks is not alone in recognizing the limits of educational reform. The work of Carnoy and Levin (1976) and Bowles and Gintis (1977), particularly, buttress Jencks' claim.

Consequently, while we must recognize that by virtue of the 14th Amendment, society's institutions are mandated to provide blacks equal protection, equal educational opportunity is not simply racial composition of schools. If that is the case, and we assume it to be so, those social scientists committed to the substance of equal educational opportunity and equity for Afro-American children must lay bare the essence of public education and the role of blacks in that institution. To the extent that such a concern is taken into account then the quality of education rather than the racial composition of the school is of critical importance. Further, and more directly, the question becomes: to what extent will education or schooling change the status of blacks in this society? According to Bowles and Gintis (1977) and Carnoy and Levin (1976) a primary function of the public schools is to reproduce the social order. Consequently, if blacks are low status in the larger society, they will be low status in schools. And while there is an interactive dynamic between the society and schools, the prevailing or more forceful dynamic is the impact of the larger society on schools and not the reverse. Such an assertion is not inconsistent with the Coleman's (1966) finding that factors external to the school (e.g. class position) were the best predictors of school performance. These assertions strongly suggest the schools reflect society rather than determine its character. Such being the case we might conclude with Jencks that racial balance, as a reform, will not alter the status of blacks in society.

William Wilson and Kathryn See (1976) suggest a similar argument when they state that present notions to change the status of blacks through school reform, particularly desegregation is "myopic." Relative to research on desegregation they state:

> Although these analyses [on school desegregation] raise interesting and important issues, they fail to address more fundamental questions about the role of urban schools in our advanced industrial society and the extent to which structural changes in the economy intervene with schooling to determine the social position of urban workers (1976:1).

In other words the schools not only reflect the social order but are controlled by it. That is to say that the position of blacks in society is based on their relationship to means of production. They go on to state:

> [T]he strong association between urban public schools and the reproduction of the low wage labor supply will not be significantly affected by programs to achieve desegregation, or by any other programs to improve inner-city schools, if they are not also designed to offset the problems of educational content and quality which have become attached to working class schools (1976: 14)

These thoughts tend to confirm our earlier assessment that racial balance might well be a hoax to have blacks attack those "racist lower class whites" with few benefits accuring to blacks in the process.

We might also note that Wilson and See's claim did not just suggest the need for a change in the structure and content of black schools but (white) working class schools as well. This is a very important point which is related to our second issue: What might be a more general

meaning of white resistance to busing? As we view such white communities as Boston's Charlestown and South Boston and Chicago's Marquette Park these are working class communities which are probably not substantially different from their black counterparts in Roxbury and the southside in Chicago. According to the Wilson and See argument the content and quality of these schools are probably not substantially different. There are more similarities than differences in these working class schools (black or white) than in what way does racial balance effect the outcomes for black children? Instead of these working class communities, both black and white, joining forces to press for beneficial reforms such as additional finance, additional control, etc., they find themselves at war with each other. Such battles tend to keep race salient and at the same time obsure the class nature of schooling and, more importantly, the society itself. Such battles tend to feed the false consciousness of whites. It is not uncommon for poor whites and working class whites to believe that they are "better off" than all blacks. Such a notion is a delusion. But the racial balance policy continues to reinforce such an erroneous perception. Even more, antagonisms every Fall as a result of racial balance conflicts might well be a prelude to facism through a repeat of the race wars a la 1919. Consequently, it is time for sober thinking and policy alternatives which serve the interests of Afro-Americans and like situated people.

In summary and conclusion

The primary concern here has been equity in education for Afro-Americans. It was acknowledged that coercive separation, i.e. segregation, does constitute a violation of justice and equility for Afro-Americans. Such separation serves to subordinate the status of the separated group. On the other hand all separation does not constitute subordinated status and to promote such a notion has its own racist consequences. Policies based on a premise that all racial concentration consitutes inferiority serves as a basis for the destruction of black institutions of which schools in the past were primary. Also a policy which requires that it must be blacks who are always in a minority as racial balance does, is also racist. As Charles V. Willie (1976) a black professor at Harvard points out in reference to the Massachussetts racial balance law:

> The law itself could be described as racist because it declared illegal, and therefore not in the public interest, any school which had a majority black student body. The principle enuciated is that it is not in the public interest for whites to be a minority in any Massachussetts school....(1976:8).

In addition to challenging racial balance, conceptually, evidence on the appropiateness and adequacy of this remedy to racial inequality in education was also presented. For evidence on the results of school "desegregation" two analytic reviews served as prime sources. These two reviews of the bulk of desegregation studies show that little, if any, benefits accrue to black or white students as a result of changes in racial composition of schools. In fact, these reviews indicate that the claims of the racial balance advocates are not at all conclusive and are at best inconsistent.

Apart from the examination of the "Promise of Brown" around the question of race the limitation of such a reform was explored in light of the class bias of schools. That is, if schools tend to reproduce social relations of production then it must be recognized that "correcting" racial composition will hardly effect this more fundamental feature of schools. Further we must be cautious that by keeping race salient our analyses do not feed the false consciousness of whites and thereby drive a larger wedge between segments of our population who have more in common than differences.

Finally, in light of the inequalites endured by black children as a result of the racial balance policy it is incumbent on those scholars committed to equal educational opportunity that the across-the-board racial balance policy of H.E.W and the courts be viewed with the utmost of circumspection particularly relative to the issue of quality education for black students. These scholars should raise into question their fundamental axiom that "anything all (or predominately) black is bad." Such an assumption has its own racist underpinnings and more often than not gives rise to racial composition being more important than any other lesson to be learned. In fact, these scholars might take the lead from black scholars who so cogently raise these more fundamental questions as exemplied by a recent issue of the Journal of Negro Education. (1978)

In sum, equity and equality for black children are the central issues in this overall concern not racial mixing.

References

Armstrong, C. and A.J. Gregor, "Integrated Schools and Negro Character Development," in White Racism and Black Americans, Bromley and Longino (eds.), Cambridge: Schenekman Books, 1972.

Armor, David, "The Evidence on Busing" The Public Interest, #28, Summer, 1972, pp. 90-126.

Bain, Read, "Segregation" in A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, Gould and W. Kolb (ed.), New York: Free Press, 1964.

Baratz, S. and J. Baratz, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism" Harvard Educational Review

Barnes, H. Elmer, An Introduction to the History of Sociology, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Bell, Derrick, Jr. "Waiting on the Promise of Brown" in Law and Contemporary Problems, v 39, School of Law Duke University, Spring, 1975.

Bennentt, Lenore Jr., Before the Mayflower, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962.

Berkely Gazette. "Desegregation is Failing to Meet Education Goals" March 17, 1976, pg. 1.

Berurbe and M. Gittell (eds.), Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville, New York: Praeger, 1966.

Bowles, S. and H. Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Carmichael, Stokely and Charles Hamilton, Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America, New York: Random House, 1967.

Carnoy, Martin, Education as Culture of Imperialism, New York: McKay, 1974.

_____, and H. Levin, The Limits a Educational Reform, New York: McKay, 1976.

Chambers, Julius, "Implementing the Promise of Brown: A Look to the Future," in Education, Social Science and the Judicial Process, National Institute of Education, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Clark, Kenneth, Prejudice and Your Child, Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

_____ and Mamie Clark, "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," in Readings in Social Psychology, New York: Holt and Company, 1947.

Coleman, James, "Racial Segregation in the Schools: New Research with New Policy Implications," Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1975: pp. 75-78.

DuBois, W.E.B., "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools" (1935) in W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader, Meyer Weinberg (ed) New York: Harper

_____, "Whither Now and Why" (1960) in The Education of Black People, Herbert Aptheker (ed.), New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973.

Edmonds, Ron etial "A Black Response to Christopher Jencks" Harvard ED Review, February, 1975

Fraizer, E. Franklin, Negro Youth at the Crossways, New York: Schocken Books, 1943 (1969).

_____, "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual" on Race Relations, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Gordon, Milton, Assimilation in American Life, New York: Oxford University Press, 1964 (1977).

Grant, William "Community Control vs. Desegregation: The Detroit Case" in The Public Interest, #24, Summer, 1971.

Green, Robert and Thomas Pettigrew, "Urban Desgregation and White Flight: A Response to Coleman," in Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1976: pp. 399-402.

Guterman, Stanley S., Black Psyche, Berekely, California: Glendessary Press, Inc., 1972.

Handlin, Oscar, "The Goals of Integration," in Daedulos, Winter, 1965.

Horton, John

Jencks, C Iequality, New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Johnson, Charles S., Growing Up in the Black Belt, New York: Schocken Books, 1940.

Jones, N.R. "Is Brown Obsolete? No" Integrated Education, May/June, 1076.

Journal of Negro Education, The v.47, #1 (winter) 1978.

Killian, Lewis, The Impossible Revolutions 2nd Phase, New York: Random House, 1975.

Maynard, Robert, "Black Nationalism and Community Schools," in Community Control of Schools, Henry Levin (ed.), New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.

Merton, Robert., "Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in The Sociology of Knowledge." In varieties of Political Expression in Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Metzger, L. Paul, American Sociology and Black Assimiation: Conflicting Perspecitves," in American Journal of Sociology, 1971: pp. 626-647.

Pettigrew, Thomas et al., "Busing: A Review of the Evidence" Public Interest (Winter, 1973), pp. 88-118.

Rubin, Lillian B., Busing and Backlash: White against White in a California School District, Berekely: University of California Press, 1972.

St. John, Nancy, School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Sizemore, Barbara, "Educational Research and Desegregation: Significance for the Black Community in The Journal of Negro Education v. 47, #1 (Winer) 1978.

Stephan, Walter, "School Desegregation: An Evaluation of Predictions Made in Brown vs. Board of Education" in Psychological Bulletin, v. 85 #2, (March), 1978.

Sowell, Thomas, Black Education: Myths and Tragedies, New York: David McKay Co., 1972.

Taylor, Howard, "Playing The Dozens with Path Analysis" in Sociology of Education, v. 46 #4, Fall 1973, 433-450.

Theodordon, G., and A. Theodorson, Modern Dictionary of Sociology, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1969.

Thomas, W.I. "Definition of the Situation" in Social Psychology Manis and Meltzer (eds), Boston: Allyn and Becon, 1976.

U.S. Commission of Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in Public Schools, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S., 347 (1954)

Willie, Charles V., Race Mixing in Public School. New York: Praeger, 1973. "Racial Balance or Quality Education" in School Desegregation Shadow and Substance, F. Levinsohn and B. Wright (eds.): Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

_____, "On Merton's Insiders and Outsiders:" American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78.

Wilson, William and Katherane See, "Urban School Desegregation and Structural Changes in the Economy," presented at A.S.A. Meetings, 1976.

FOOTNOTES

1. A part of the New York teacher's union opposition to decentralization was couched in terms that such a policy led to "separatism" as opposed to "integration." See "Excerpts from UFT Policy Statement on Decentralization" in Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville, Berube and Gittell (eds.), New York: Praeger, 1969. See also "Community Control vs. School Integration: The Case of Detroit" by William Grant in The Public Interest, #24 (Summer, 1971), pp. 62-79.

2. One could argue that racism has so effected a substantial segment of the populations of South Boston, Louisville and Marquette Park in Chicago that it is they who are in dire need of compensatory education. That would be consistent with the report of the Joint Commision on Children and Mental Health which conducted that racism was the #1 mental health problem in America.

3. By "liberal" social scientists we are not name-calling but stressing an ideological orientation which strongly suggests that Afro-Americans are "only white men with black skins" ..."stampp, The Peculiar Institutions, New York: Random House 1956, p. vii. See also Horton (1966), Metzgar (197) and Baratz and Baratz (1970) for a full discussion of the liberal ideological underpinnings of social science as they relate to "minorities" of color and race relations. Central to the liberal ideology is a belief in the deficit or pathology of those minorities, particularly Afro-Americans, and the necessity of those minorities to adopt a middle class "Anglo-conformity" norm.

TABLE I

Northern and Southern Black Children on Coloring Test*

Region of Sample	Brown	Color of "Looking Like" Face		
		White	Other Color	
South	80%	15%	5%	100%
North	35%	44%	20%	100%

*See Kenneth B. Clark, Prejudice and Your Child, 1963, p. 43-46.

TABLE 2

Effects of Desegregation on Black Achievement*

Finding	Studies		
	Published	Unpublished	Total
Desegregated schools lower than segregated schools	0	1	1
Desegregated schools equal to segregated schools or mixed effects due to desegregation	9	14	23
Desegregated schools higher than segregated schools	6	4	10

*Source: Stephan (1978)

TABLE 3

Effects of Desegregation on Prejudice *

Funding	Studies		
	Published	Unpublished	Total
Black Prejudice toward whites			
Decrease	3	3	6
No change	0	1	1
Increase	3	2	5
White Prejudice toward blacks			
Decrease	1	1	2
No change	4	1	5
Increase	4	4	8

*Source: Stephan (1978)